

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT**

ENDC/PV.189
11 June 1964
ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 7 1964

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 11 June 1964, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. C. LUKANOV

(Bulgaria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A. CORREA do LAGO
Miss L. de VINCENZI
Mr. E. HOSANNAH

Bulgaria:

Mr. C. LUKANOV
Mr. G. GHELEV
Mr. T. DAMLIANOV
Mr. G. YANKOV

Burma:

U SAIN BWA
U HTOON SHEIN

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. R.M. TAIT
Mr. C.J. MARSHALL

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. PECHOTA
Mr. V. VAJNAR
Mr. A. MIKULIN

Ethiopia:

Ato S. TEFERRA

India:

Mr. K.P. LUKOSE

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. E. GUIDOTTI
Mr. S. AVETTA
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI

Mexico:

Mr. A. Gomez ROBLEDO
Mr. Manuel TELLO
Mr. J. MERCADO

Nigeria:

Mr. L.C.N. OBI

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Poland:

Mr. N. NASZKOWSKI
Mr. M. LACHS
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI
Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI

Romania:

Mr. V. DUMITRESCU
Mr. E. GLASER
Mr. N. ECCOBESCU
Mr. C. UNGUREANU

Sweden:

Mr. P. LIND
Mr. P. HAMMARSKJOLD
Mr. B. VEGESACK

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.A. ZORIN
Mr. L.I. MENDELYEVICH
Mr. V.M. BASKAKOV
Mr. I.M. PALENYKH

United Arab Republic:

Mr. A.F. HASSAN
Mr. A. OSMAN
Mr. M. KASSEM
Mr. S.E. IBRAHIM

United Kingdom:

Sir Paul MASON
Mr. J.G. TAHOUDIN
Mr. A.J. WILLIAMS

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER
Mr. C.H. TIMBERLAKE
Mr. D.S. MACDONALD
Mr. R.A. MARTIN

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from Russian): I declare open the one hundred and eighty-ninth meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) (translation from French): I wish first of all to add my sincere condolences to those expressed on 9 June (ENDC/PV.188) by my colleagues to the Indian delegation on the death of that eminent statesman Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. The Polish people heard with deep grief the news of the decease of that fervant champion of peace and peaceful co-existence, the man who clearly saw all the dangers arising from the arms race and from the development of lethal nuclear weapons, and who at the same time showed an understanding of the problems of European security.

I should also like to thank those delegates who welcomed me on the day this session began. I too should like to greet our new colleagues in this Committee and express the certainty that they, together with us veterans of the Committee, if I may so put it, will make a constructive contribution to our labours.

Lastly I should like to express our pleasure at the presence in our midst of the co-Chairmen of the Committee: Mr. Zorin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, and Mr. Foster, Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

I should now like to make a few general remarks on our Committee's work and on the tasks assigned to it. During the two years before our last recess, we made a profound analysis of disarmament problems. The positions of both sides were clarified. However, it must be stated bluntly that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament is neither an academic gathering nor a centre for theoretical studies. That was not how the General Assembly of the United Nations saw the Committee's role when it assigned to it urgent and specific tasks. Above all, that is not how the peoples of the world saw the Committee's role.

That observation seems to me all the more relevant since, during the period in question, certain events took place in international life which provided a better starting point for a discussion of disarmament problems. Since 1963 the Great Powers have reached certain agreements which have improved the international climate. I refer, of course, to the Moscow Treaty for a partial ban on nuclear weapon tests, the agreement forbidding the placing in orbit around the earth of

(Mr. Naszkowski, Poland)

weapons of mass destruction and the simultaneous decisions taken this spring by the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom on curtailing the production of fissionable materials for military purposes. As will be seen, these agreements concern matters lying within our Committee's purview. Nor should it be forgotten that our Committee's discussions, and the initiatives of certain delegations, particularly those of the group of non-aligned countries, have to some extent contributed to the conclusion of these agreements among the Great Powers. I refer especially to the agreement on a partial nuclear test ban.

There can be no doubt, however, that our Committee's work has not so far done much to widen the breach made in the barrier of the cold war by those agreements. If we remember that that barrier still covers a vast area, we have good reason to fear that these initial agreements, modest but encouraging, will not cause that chain reaction towards peace, the development of mutual confidence, or disarmament, which we all desire. Nor must we forget that a setback, or even stagnation, in the movement towards a détente would be accompanied by a constant and increasingly dangerous development of armaments, particularly nuclear armaments, and by the creation of new, and the aggravation of old, sources of tension.

Hence, when we strike a balance between the successes achieved in the liquidation of the cold war and the dangers created by the quantitative and qualitative acceleration of the arms race, we feel that there is a greater chance than ever before, and an ever more imperative need, to make progress in our work. In our view, it is urgently necessary to break the deadlock which prevails in the most important problem of our era: general and complete disarmament.

The socialist States, always anxious to make progress in this field, have, as you know, submitted during these negotiations several new proposals making allowance for the various apprehensions and suggestions of the West. Unfortunately these efforts by the delegations of the socialist States have not met with the hoped-for response from the Western delegations. We hope that the representatives of the Western countries will modify their attitude and will likewise show goodwill and inventiveness in the search for new solutions which could create a solid basis for fruitful talks on the establishment of a programme of general and complete disarmament. The new proposal submitted by the Soviet Union at the first meeting of this session, on a procedure for discussing the idea of a "nuclear umbrella" (ENDC/PV.188, p. 17), certainly opens up new possibilities of negotiation, and we are sure that it will be duly welcomed.

(Mr. Naszkowski, Poland)

Apart from our main task, which is to establish a programme of general and complete disarmament, the Polish delegation also attaches great importance to limited measures likely to bring about immediately an appreciable reduction in international tension and a halt in the armaments race. Numerous proposals of this kind have already been submitted in the course of this Conference. On the basis of an analysis of these proposals and in the light of the present international situation, it can be affirmed that several of them could be carried out easily and without delay.

In our opinion these proposals include effective steps to prevent the dissemination of nuclear weapons, a reduction in armed forces, a reduction in military budgets, and the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries. The adoption of several of these partial measures simply depends on a political decision. I should like to stress that no military or strategic considerations can justify continued delay in or opposition to the implementation of those proposals. That is the great advantage of partial measures, and constitutes the essential characteristic of the present international situation.

Among the problems calling for an early solution, mention should be made of a halt in the continuous acceleration of the arms race in the most dangerous field, that of nuclear weapons. This need is particularly acute in territories where the military forces of the two groups face each other, where enormous stocks of weapons of mass destruction are accumulated, and where there are still numerous sources of tension which could engender a nuclear war. I refer in particular to Central Europe.

The Polish Government, aware of the serious threat to peace in this area, has repeatedly put forward constructive proposals. That was the main object of the plan for creating a denuclearized zone in Central Europe, likewise submitted on 28 March 1962 in the form of a memorandum (ENDC/C.1/1) to the Eighteen-Nation Committee. Wishing to make a fresh contribution to the strengthening of security in Central Europe, the Polish Government recently submitted a proposal for freezing nuclear weapons in that area. That plan, which was proposed by Mr. Gomulka, contains several elements constituting a logical whole: it seeks, first, to put a brake on the arms race; secondly, to prevent any further dissemination of nuclear weapons; and thirdly, to achieve a ban on the production of nuclear weapons by States not possessing them.

(Mr. Naszkowski, Poland)

This proposal has been favourably received by world public opinion, by important political circles, and by several statesmen, even in the West, particularly those who appraise the political and military situation in Europe with increasing realism and are aware of the danger of a continued accumulation of nuclear weapons on our continent. All these circles consider that the Polish proposal provides a constructive and easily-realizable opportunity to take a step forward in the direction of disarmament and relaxation of tension in Europe, the effects of which could facilitate the solution of other and greater problems.

There have also been objections to the Polish plan. I regret to say that they are the result of outmoded ways of thinking, of fears which even in the past were groundless and which are particularly unconvincing in regard to our latest proposal. It is this way of thinking in circles discredited by the realities of life which makes it so difficult to take any step forward, even in easy problems which are ripe for solution. Every reasonable man understands more and more clearly that the cold-war policy, which was so harmful to the whole world and caused so many conflicts and complications, must finally be relegated to the archives of history. Now can anyone argue that the balance will be upset when all that is involved is a plan to freeze nuclear weapons in their present state, over an equivalent area on each side? The other objections are equally groundless. They are put forward in various quarters: on the one hand, by soldiers and politicians who are still obsessed by the mirage of achieving superiority in the field of improvement and multiplication of weapons of destruction; and on the other by those who are already half aware of the need for entering on the path of peaceful co-existence but who still fear the effects of what they consider too rapid progress towards disarmament.

Clearly the promoters of this policy of postponing and obstruction of agreements likely to reduce tension, who regard the Gomulka plan and others like it as a threat to their own interests, are the governmental circles at Bonn. It is they who are trying to maintain tension in Europe, to obtain access in one way or another to nuclear weapons, and to preserve the dangerous fiction of a possible revision of frontiers in Europe. Hence they regard our plan as a barrier and an obstacle to the achievement of their policy. But are their objectives really so close to the guiding principles of the policy of the Western Powers that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany still has a chance -- and even, in

(Mr. Naszkowski, Poland)

the case of certain problems an increasing chance -- of influencing Western policy? Has now the time come for Western governments to see the inexpediency and dangers of this method of always yielding to the inspirations of their Bonn ally?

Despite the objections hitherto raised to our plan, we should like to believe that the dialogue started by Poland through diplomatic channels can be continued constructively. It is merely a question of showing goodwill, of which there is no lack on our side. The Polish Government is pursuing an active policy designed to achieve a détente, liquidate focuses of tension, and improve the international situation, in this field as in others. I need only mention the recent Polish proposal concerning a settlement of the Laos question. Nor shall we relax our efforts to bring about an atmosphere more propitious to our Committee's labours.

In recent years we have observed a continuous improvement in the international climate. This process, which has met with some opposition in certain quarters, has nevertheless already led to an appreciable reduction in international tension. It should, however, be stressed that, among steps to improve the international situation, due **priority** must be given to disarmament problems. It is difficult to see how appreciable progress can be made in consolidating peace when an armaments race is going on and when arsenals are being increased.

It is our Committee's task to take steps through which a beginning can be made with emptying the arsenals, lightening the burden of armaments, which crushes the peoples of the world by lowering their standard of living, and extinguishing the embers of conflict in especially sensitive areas which are also highly saturated with lethal weapons. That is why we must take maximum advantage of the chance offered by this continuing trend towards a relaxation of tension. It entails the need to discard outworn shibboleths and reject anything which could make an understanding more difficult. It is high time we entered upon a thorough discussion of these problems and agreed on specific steps.

Ato TEFERRA (Ethiopia): This morning I should like to make a brief statement of a general character.

Permit me first of all, on behalf of the Ethiopian delegation, to extend a warm welcome to those representatives who are participating for the first time in the work of our Conference. I should also like to say that my delegation is happy to see once again the other representatives in this chamber.

(Ato Teferra, Ethiopia)

When our Conference went into recess on 28 April of this year my delegation, like most other delegations, held -- and it still holds -- the opinion that the Conference would produce after its resumption a much more appreciable result than hitherto. It is with that conviction that my delegation has come to this Conference once more.

It is quite true that a number of positive results have been obtained since the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament started its work two years ago. Those achievements encourage us more than ever to negotiate the problem of disarmament. Undoubtedly they have paved the way -- though in a limited manner -- towards general and complete disarmament. They may even have forced those with pessimistic views to change their ideas about general and complete disarmament. One might say that those are the indirect results of this Committee's negotiations over two years. But if, instead of rejoicing over what we have achieved during those two years, we contemplate what we could have done during that time, then one might be inclined to change one's opinion. During the past two years humanity has lived with fear and terror. This was due mainly to the presence of weapons of mass destruction on earth: those years would have been the last years for humanity if war had occurred, by miscalculation or otherwise.

Consequently my delegation strongly urges this Committee to find ways and means of arriving at general and complete disarmament. My delegation is of the opinion that to do so we must deviate from all generalities and try to tackle the problem in terms of specific action. In order to do that, my delegation deems it necessary for the Committee to adopt some sort of programme of work. Unless we do so, we might be compelled to proceed as we did during the last session of our Committee -- and if we do that my delegation is less optimistic about our arriving at a positive result.

As has been indicated by previous speakers both this morning and last Tuesday, our Committee has reconvened in a propitious atmosphere. Let us not spare any effort to utilize this opportunity. If we fail to do so, we shall be failing ourselves.

Mr. DUMITRESCU (Romania) (translation from French): I wish first of all to associate my delegation with the sincere condolences tendered to the Indian delegation by previous speakers on the sad loss suffered by the Indian people through the death of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, an eminent statesman and an outstanding personality in international public life, who made a substantial contribution to the cause of peace and international co-operation. The passing of Pandit Nehru -- whose work and thought are a clear demonstration of the indissoluble unity of mankind's great ideals: peace, freedom and progress -- is a heavy loss for all humanity. We express the hope that the noble ideals for which Pandit Nehru strove will be fulfilled, for the sake of the great Indian people and the cause of peace.

My delegation also associates itself with other delegations in wishing our colleague, Ambassador Abate Agede, a speedy recovery.

We welcome among us our new colleagues, Mr. Antonio Gomez Robledo, representative of Mexico, and Mr. Antonio Correa do Lago, representative of Brazil. We likewise greet those colleagues who have returned to us after a recess of some weeks: Mr. Valerian Zorin, the Soviet representative and Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs; Mr. William Foster, the United States representative -- both of whom are resuming their functions as co-Chairmen of our Committee --; Mr. Naszkowski, Polish representative and Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs; Mr. Pechota, Czechoslovak representative; Mr. Protitch, Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations; and also all those colleagues with whom we have had the honour of working in this Committee during the previous session.

I do not intend today to enter into the details of the proposals before our Committee and of the problems on which we shall be asked to concentrate our efforts. My delegation will set forth its views in due course. We have listened with great attention to the previous speakers. It seems to us that the recess has been really useful and has enabled us to meditate more deeply on the problems before us. This confirms the opinion which we expressed before we went into recess: that the suggestions and exchanges of views during the previous session were not fruitless.

In the various observations made by all the delegates who have spoken, we find the common idea that the disarmament problem is increasingly acute today, in view of the danger represented by modern weapons and the enormous waste of material

(Mr. Dumitrescu, Romania)

resources on armaments, and that general and complete disarmament strikes a profound chord in the masses, for all the peoples of the world rightly demand that disarmament should begin. True, the most important result achieved in recent years is that peace has been maintained and there have been the beginnings of a relaxation of tension in international life. In our delegation's view, this provides our Committee with wider opportunities than in the past to make progress in carrying out the assignment given to it by the United Nations. Our delegation shares the view expressed by several previous speakers, that we must now pass on to a systematic discussion of the specific problems listed on the Committee's agenda, giving priority to those on which we are likely to reach agreement.

To be sure, the Great Powers, and above all the nuclear ones, bear an especial responsibility for the maintenance and consolidation of peace. But for the initiation of disarmament no State, large or small, can be exempted from its responsibilities. Each State has the sacred duty of actively and indefatigably campaigning for and contributing to a decrease in international tension and a negotiated solution of the problems pending between States.

As experience has proved, when the language of threats is renounced, when realism, wisdom, patience and perseverance are shown, mutually-acceptable solutions can be found for the most complex and thorny problems, such as those before our Committee. That is the spirit in which the Romanian delegation has been instructed by its Government to act, and in that spirit it will make its modest contribution to the efforts which all of us are called on to make, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, for the consolidation of peace and the development of international co-operation.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from Russian): I should now like to speak in my capacity as representative of Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian delegation, on behalf of the people and Government of Bulgaria, wishes first of all to associate itself with all those here who have expressed to the people of friendly India through its delegation their sincere condolences upon the death of the great Indian patriot Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. In Bulgaria that great national leader and statesman was well known, not only as the creator of the modern Indian State, but also as an international statesman, an advocate of the peaceful co-existence of all States, a friend of all peoples, and an ardent supporter of the idea of creating a world without arms and without war. The name of Jawaharlal Nehru will live for ever.

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

During the last meetings of the last session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, all delegations expressed the hope and the wish that the recess would not be a period of inactivity but, on the contrary, would be used to the fullest extent for serious preparatory work which would open up new prospects for the future activity of the Committee and would lead to concrete, positive results. That hope and that wish were perfectly logical, especially since in three months the work of the Committee, which had started, as everyone recognized, in much more favourable circumstances than ever before, failed nevertheless to achieve any tangible, practical results. There is no doubt that the peoples judge the success or failure of our efforts above all by how much closer the results of the negotiations within the Eighteen-Nation Committee bring us, really and in fact, to the solution of the main problem -- general and complete disarmament.

Whether we express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with our work is something that least of all determines the peoples' assessment of it. However unpleasant the admission may be, the results of the discussions at the last session of the Committee provide no grounds for any particular optimism. In our opinion, we must call a spade a spade. I do not think it is possible for us, still less that it would be useful for our future work, to try to hide the disquieting fact that the Eighteen-Nation Committee is not yet in a position to report to the peoples of the world and to the United Nations any success in making progress towards the fulfilment of the main task assigned to it: the reaching of agreement on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

It is beyond all doubt that the cause of disarmament necessitates untiring and persistent efforts. Nevertheless, it is also beyond question that time is not on our side and that therefore it is necessary to make haste, because general and complete disarmament is not only the most important but also the most urgent problem facing mankind, since it is recognized that only general disarmament will safeguard peace.

The history of negotiations on disarmament provides many examples showing that in the past, every time the representatives of States re-assembled at the conference table, it became evident that they had not kept up with events. If that has been so in the past, in these days of an arms race without precedent in scale and pace such a failure to keep up with events is even more fraught with danger. The

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

necessity of adopting urgent and radical measures in seeking to solve the problem of general and complete disarmament is determined by the very nature of modern weapons, as well as by the nature of a possible world conflict. The significance of the time factor is revealed with particular clearness in the light of the single fact that, in the era of nuclear missile weapons, mankind is faced for the first time with the new danger, unknown in the past, of a world conflict resulting from error or accident.

The significance of the time factor and the necessity of speeding the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament derive from the fact that, while the Committee continues to hold meetings -- and it has been holding meetings for more than two years -- the arms race is continuing. Moreover, it is continuing systematically, without delay and without hesitation. At the same time the direct result of this race is the growing danger and risk of a thermonuclear conflict, with all the consequences which it would entail and which every sane-minded person is now aware of and recognizes. All the more concern is bound to be caused by the slow pace -- not to use a more caustic term -- of the Committee's work. Particular concern is aroused by the attempts of certain delegations, using the slogan of optimism, to direct the Committee's attention more and more to partial measures instead of to the main task. If we are to speak of optimism, then there are no greater optimists than the peoples and governments of the socialist countries, who know that general disarmament will be accomplished without fail.

As for the Bulgarian people and the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, they are profoundly convinced that a decisive and fundamental breakthrough can be brought about in the work of the Committee, in the disarmament negotiations. We are convinced that disarmament is not only vitally necessary but also completely feasible, and that the obstacles and embarrassments in the path to an agreement can be overcome without any particular difficulty, if all the countries concerned really show good will and a sincere desire to achieve a just and mutually-acceptable solution of the problems which have so far prevented progress in our work.

Thus our criticism, which is concerned with the lack of practical results in our negotiations, is not dictated by pessimism but by the desire to move forward in accordance with the demand of the time factor. Let us take a concrete example. As we know, the Committee's attention has been focussed on a problem of paramount

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

importance, an agreement on which could have a decisive influence on the future of the negotiations on general and complete disarmament. The participants in the work of the Committee have had an opportunity to convince themselves of the advantages and significance of the Soviet proposal which we call the proposal for a "nuclear umbrella" (ENDC/2/Rev.1/Add.1). The lengthy discussions on that question have shown the realistic nature of the Soviet proposal, its feasibility in practice, and its fairness from the point of view of the security interests of all the countries concerned. The purpose of this important Soviet proposal is to take a decisive step towards bringing the positions closer together on a key problem of general and complete disarmament: elimination of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles.

One can only express regret that the Western Powers have not shown similar good will and readiness to seek a mutually-acceptable solution to this problem, the importance of which they themselves do not deny. In this respect their position, as has become evident during the discussions in the Committee, has remained rather remote from the position of the majority of the countries represented in the Committee, as well as from the estimation of world public opinion of the importance of the proposal for a "nuclear umbrella". The position of the Western Powers has prevented the Committee from recording any progress in the three months of its work on this question.

The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria therefore welcomes the Soviet Union's further contribution in respect of the problem of a "nuclear umbrella". We see in this yet another convincing confirmation of the unceasing efforts of the Soviet Government to facilitate and speed the solution of this main problem facing the Committee. This contribution once again confirms the readiness of the Soviet Union to take into consideration any proposal that is likely to lead to rapid and substantial results in the disarmament negotiations. Bearing in mind the wishes of the Western countries, the Soviet delegation has now expressed its readiness to participate immediately in the consideration in an appropriate working body, of specific questions connected with the elimination of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles, if the Committee, as proposed by the delegation of India before the recess, (ENDC/PV.177/pp.28 et seq.) approves the proposal for a "nuclear umbrella" as a basis for the solution of the problem of eliminating nuclear

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

weapon delivery vehicles. The Bulgarian delegation hopes that this new step by the Soviet Government will meet with a positive attitude on the part of the Western Powers and that they will take advantage of this opportunity to manifest in deed their desire to carry on constructive negotiations.

Some delegations have stressed in their introductory statements the need to turn from general statements to businesslike negotiations on specific practical questions. The Committee now has such an opportunity, and we see no reason that could prevent it from proceeding immediately to detailed and concrete negotiations on the basis of the principle of a "nuclear umbrella". It will easily be understood that, if the Committee accepts such an approach, the prospects for fruitful work in the days and weeks ahead will be considerably better than they have ever been in the past.

The representative of the United States has reminded us once again of the words used by President Johnson in his New Year message to Prime Minister Khrushchev: that "the time for simply talking about peace ... has passed -- 1964 should be a year in which we take further steps toward that goal." We should be happy to welcome any step in support of this statement of the President; and we should welcome with particular warmth any step by the delegations of the United States and other Western Powers that would facilitate mutual understanding and a movement forward in the main direction of our work -- in negotiations on general and complete disarmament.

During the past ten months a number of measures have been carried out which have led to a certain relaxation of tension in international relations. The agreements reached have shown that, given the existence of good will on the part of all the countries concerned, results can be achieved in a field of exceptional importance -- that is, in the field of nuclear disarmament on the way to general and complete disarmament. The first steps taken in this direction have also shown, as the representative of the Soviet Union has stressed, --

"... that there is no fatal inevitability of an unbridled competition in producing and improving weapons and the means of warfare, just as there is no fatal inevitability of war itself." (ENDC/PV.188, p. 15)

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

This unquestionably right conclusion seems to us particularly important, and it could serve as a guiding principle in the discussion of individual measures that would strengthen confidence between the Powers, reduce international tension, and thus facilitate the solution of the main problem of general and complete disarmament.

In this respect our Committee has had in the present year an opportunity of considering a number of proposals which, as the discussions have shown unequivocally, have met with very wide support, not only from the socialist countries. One such measure, to which the Committee properly devoted a considerable part of its attention during the last session, is the reduction of the military budgets of States by 10 to 15 per cent. We should like to hope that the delegations of the Western Powers have found it possible to take into account the views expressed by the delegations of the socialist and non-aligned countries regarding the significance of this proposal by the Soviet Union from the point of view of slowing the arms race, as well as from the point of view that this measure can be easily implemented.

Moreover, as a number of delegations have pointed out, a decision on a reduction of military budgets would be the most reliable indication of the serious intention of the Powers to embark decisively on the path of disarmament. It is obvious that if one bases oneself on considerations of the maximum effect in halting any further arms race, this measure will be significant if it is carried out in the first place by those Powers which possess considerable military strength and expend vast sums for military purposes.

At the last session of the Committee the exceptional importance of the problem of the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons was stressed once again. All delegations, including those of the Western Powers, pointed out the urgent need to adopt measures in this direction. It was stressed in a convincing manner that considerable further difficulties might arise in the future if no effective measures were taken to block immediately all ways to a further spread of nuclear weapons. There can be no doubt that at the forthcoming nineteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly the member States will again take an interest in this problem.

The Bulgarian delegation considers that the statement made by the leader of the Soviet delegation on 9 June deserves serious attention from us all. Mr. Zorin said:

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

"It is well known that at present there is in fact only one real obstacle to a positive solution of the problem of the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons. That obstacle is the plan to create a NATO multilateral nuclear force, within which access to nuclear weapons and to participation in the control, possession and disposal of such weapons would be granted to several NATO States which at present do not possess nuclear weapons, and in the first place to Western Germany -- the only European State which demands a revision of the frontiers established as a result of the Second World War. If the elimination of that obstacle could be brought about by joint efforts, it would immediately be possible for the Committee to work out and agree on a draft treaty on the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons." (ENDC/PV.188, p. 18)

The significance of that Soviet statement must not be underestimated. All the socialist States agree with it, as do many other States of Europe and throughout the world. All those who cherish peace in Europe and throughout the world agree with it. It has also to be said that the most responsible leaders and competent experts in military matters in the West admit that the creation of a NATO multilateral nuclear force, from the purely military point of view -- that is, from the point of view of the security interests of the Powers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization -- is of no practical value. If one compares this correct evaluation with the increased efforts to speed the creation of a multilateral nuclear force, it is impossible not to perceive the real aims pursued by certain circles in Bonn, which are in such a persistent hurry to confront the world with a fait accompli. The attitude taken towards this problem, in our opinion, determines the attitude taken towards the problem of nuclear disarmament in general. We trust that the Western Powers will change their approach to this important and urgent problem so that it may be solved as quickly as possible in the interests of peace.

In our opinion, it is not a lack of proposals that prevents the achievement of substantial and concrete results in the field of so-called collateral measures. During the discussions in the past the delegation of the Soviet Union and the delegations of the other socialist countries have shown a constructive attitude, a flexible approach and a spirit of compromise towards any proposal, provided that its implementation would contribute to a further improvement of the international atmosphere, provided that it takes into account to an equal extent the security interests

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

of all the countries concerned, and, lastly, provided that it is really made in order to clear the way to disarmament and not in order to hinder and make more difficult any movement forward.

At this stage of our discussion I should like to observe that the socialist delegations have every reason to expect that the delegations of the West will also show a constructive approach, a readiness to understand the position of the other side, and a spirit of compromise in regard to a number of proposals which have long been on the agenda of our Committee.

During the last session the delegations of the Western countries kept silent or confined themselves to purely formal objections on such important and urgent questions as the question of withdrawing or, in the initial period, reducing the number of foreign troops in the territories of other States; on the question of the destruction of all bomber aircraft as a first step of actual disarmament; on the proposal for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries; on the question of establishing denuclearized zones in various parts of the world, and on other questions. A businesslike discussion of any of these proposals could ensure in a very short time substantial changes for the better in regard to bringing the points of view closer together, if all the delegations present here were to be guided by the same desire to seek for mutually-acceptable solutions as the delegations of the socialist countries have already shown on many occasions. For this reason the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria wishes to stress once again that it is participating in the negotiations of this important Conference at the present time also with clear and firm instructions to contribute with all its powers as far as possible to the success of our negotiations.

We consider that in its report to the nineteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament should refer, for the first time after two years of negotiation, in any case not only to the list of questions that have been discussed and the number of meetings held, but also to the concrete and positive results of the work of the Committee.

In concluding, I venture to associate myself with all those colleagues who have welcomed the new leaders of the delegations of Brazil and Mexico, and the representatives of the Soviet Union, Poland, the United States of America, and other countries who are again taking part in our work after a period of absence.

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

Before reading out the draft communiqué, I have the following announcement to make to you.

Our two co-Chairmen propose that, as in the past, we hold two meetings next week: a meeting on Tuesday, to be devoted to matters concerning a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament, and another on Thursday to discuss collateral measures. Let us hope and expect that our co-Chairmen will submit further proposals next week.

It was so decided.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 189th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador Carlo Lukanov, representative of Bulgaria.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Poland, Ethiopia, Romania and Bulgaria.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 16 June 1964, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.

